



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,949	08/21/2003	Andreas C. Pfahnl	077311-0117	2973
65902 7590 04/28/2009 TERADYNE, INC. c/o FOLEY & LARDER, LLP 111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE 26TH FLOOR BOSTON, MA 02199-7610				
EXAMINER				
FORD, JOHN K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3744				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/28/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

The reply filed on 2/6/09 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): see below. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Applicant's response of 2/6/09 has been studied carefully. Ignoring all of the questions regarding the details of the prior art testhead cooling system (that cooled the prior art testhead system shown in the sketch submitted 9/11/08) set forth in the examiner's 1/7/09 communication, new counsel (yet another new counsel), has produced prior art that he now states is "appropriate for use with test head electronics" (2/6/09 response, page 4, line 4). This is, of course, not what the examiner asked for. The examiner asked for, and has not yet received, "a carefully prepared sketch or suitable publication showing [a six-degrees of freedom testhead] including details of the prior art cooling system used to cool this prior art testhead. Apparently, Khater et al shows a six-degrees of freedom testhead (as does applicant's sketch of 9/11/08) however Khater does not disclose the details of the cooling system. It doesn't even disclose whether the cooling fluid is air or liquid. Furthermore neither Suga nor Fujimoto relate specifically to cooling a testhead.

Again, since there is no publication that shows the details of the prior art cooling system for cooling the prior art testhead shown in the sketch submitted 9/11/08, applicant is required to prepare a sketch "including the details of this prior art" cooling system for the "six-degrees of freedom" testhead (i.e. the testhead shown in the 9/11/08 sketch) in a way that will permit meaningful comparison to what is claimed here. It is odd that Teradyne, the current assignee, which has apparently been producing testheads for some time (as evidenced by its own US patents, such as USP 6,864,698 among many others) cannot produce a sketch of its own prior art testhead cooling system. It is not understood why counsel, after producing the sketch submitted 9/11/08 (which the examiner assumes is a sketch of one of Teradyne's prior art testhead systems), turns around in the 2/6/09 response and ignores the examiner's questions (see 1/7/09 office action) about the 9/11/08 sketch and instead relies on patents assigned to other companies (Advantest and Credence Systems) in an attempt to satisfy the original requirement.

There is a complete disconnect in applicant's response and counsel is making matters worse and confusing the examiner by not addressing the simple request that the examiner has made, nor the followup questions about the 9/11/08 sketch that applicants have produced. The sketch of the prior art testhead cooling system need not be elaborate (no more elaborate in nature than what is shown in Teradyne's USP 6,864,698) but it must illustrate the prior art cooling system used to cool the prior art testhead shown in the sketch submitted 9/11/08. The examiner is not interested in

systems that counsel views as "appropriate for use with test head electronics", the examiner asked for a sketch of the details of the prior art cooling system for the prior art testhead (yes, the actual system, not some system deemed "appropriate" for this use). Applicant must provide that which the examiner needs in order to properly examine this application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John K. Ford whose telephone number is 571-272-4911. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on 571-272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/646,949
Art Unit: 3744

Page 5

/John K. Ford/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3744